



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A POINT OF ORDER IN GREEK AND LATIN.

BY J. W. H. WALDEN.

THE copula, being but the connecting-link between the parts of the clause, has as a rule so little intrinsic value, that we are accustomed to consider it logically a matter of comparatively slight importance where in the Greek or Latin sentence it was inserted. Weil's¹ and Goodell's² statements of the facts for the Greek, and Professor Greenough's³ statement for the Latin, are, in effect, that the copula often took shelter under the cover of a more emphatic word. The truth of this can hardly be doubted, but the reason for this position is another question. Weil's explanation—and the explanation, as will be seen, applies not alone to εἰμί, but to other similar intrinsically unemphatic words as well—is as follows: An emphatic word, if followed by a word which, though syntactically necessary to the sentence, is in itself unemphatic, receives an access of emphasis from the lingering of the attention which results from the juxtaposition of the two. This principle he designates the principle of *repose of accent* (*repos d'accent*). Without intending to disprove what is true in this theory, I wish in these pages to consider briefly a few sentences, with a view to inquiring whether, after all, the theory explains the whole story, and whether there is not a logical explanation of the phenomenon here referred to.

There can, of course, hardly be a question that euphony plays a part—and, apparently, a not inconsiderable part—in the arrangement of the words in a sentence, and that it often makes practically no difference, other than a difference of euphony, which one of several orders shall be chosen. But this is not to say that, even though the meaning be not different, the shade of thought or the

¹ *L'ordre des Mots dans les Langues Anciennes comparées aux Langues Modernes*, chap. III.

² *Trans. of the Amer. Philol. Ass.*, 1890, p. 34.

³ *Grammar*, p. 391.

suggestion is exactly the same for the several collocations. Even though there be a choice of arrangements, and euphony or variety or fancy be the determining factor, we may at times be able to say that there is a difference in *feeling* between the various arrangements; and a difference in feeling suggests a difference, perhaps hardly to be analyzed, in the picture or the shade of thought.

When Cato (*R. R.* 33. 2) says *veteres* [sc. *vites*] *quam minimum castrato. potius si erit, deicito, biennioque post praecidito. vitem novellam resecari tum erit tempus, ubi valebit*, what does he suggest to us by the order of the words in the clause *tum erit tempus*? Excluding the words *vitem novellam resecari*, the important idea in the last sentence—the idea which it is intended to bring into relief—is expressed by *tum*. *Tempus* has a minimum of emphasis,—the fact that there is a time has been suggested in what precedes. The important question here is, *when* is that time? *Erit* in itself seems not to be emphatic, but it is important that it should come early in order to stamp *tum* as a fact as soon as possible; in so far it is of more importance than *tempus*. By no other order could the desired turn to the thought be given: ‘It is then that it will be time.’ If *tum tempus erit* had been written, *tum* would still be the emphatic word, but not so overwhelmingly emphatic as in the present order. *Tempus*, in that case, would be more in the way of a newly introduced idea in the thought. The point not to be overlooked is, that, while *tempus* would be more emphatic, *tum* would be less so, and this not through loss of its prominent position, but on account of the change in the order of the other two words. An example in which the copula finds its place after *tempus*, and not after the particle, is Liv. v. 12. 8, *inter has iras plebis in patres cum tribuni plebi nunc illud tempus esse dicerent stabiliendae libertatis et . . .* Though *nunc* is emphatic, *illud tempus* is also prominent, and the position of *esse*, by bringing *illud* into greater prominence, gives to the gerundives which follow more of the character of explanatory clauses than they would have if *esse* followed *nunc*. In Liv. iv. 2. 2, *cuius rei praemium sit in civitate, eam maximis semper auctibus crescere*, the word *sit*, by lending its whole force to *praemium*, acts as a prop to that word. The connection between the two words is closer, and *praemium* gains something more of emphasis than would be the case if *sit* followed *civitate*.

The following sentences may be compared :

(1) Liv. vii. 13. 8, sin autem non tuum istuc, sed publicum *est* consilium; (2) Caes. B. G. ii. 1, coniurandi has *esse* causas; (3) Liv. i. 50. 9, dixisse enim nullam brevior *esse* cognitionem quam . . .; (4) Liv. vii. 13. 7, quid enim aliud *esse* causae credamus . . .; (5) Cic. *de Fin.* i. 10, Latīnam linguam non modo non inopem, ut vulgo putarent, locupletior *esse* quam Graecam; (6) Cic. *de Fin.* i. 18, hunc naturalem *esse* omnium corporum motum; (7) Nep. *Thras.* 2. 1, hoc initium *fuit* salutis Atticorum; (8) Liv. xxii. 14. 4, nec ulla *erat* mentio pugnae; (9) Nep. *Alc.* 1. 2, quod tanta *erat* commendatio oris atque orationis ut . . .; (10) Liv. vi. 41. 11, tanta dulcedo *est* ex alienis fortunis praedandi; (11) Sall. *Jug.* 85. 8, quae ante vostra beneficia gratuite faciebam, ea uti accepta mercede deseram non *est* consilium; (12) Liv. i. 47. 5, si ad haec parum *est* animi; (13) Caes. B. G. i. 21, qualis *esset* natura montis et qualis in circuitu ascensus; (14) Caes. B. G. vii. 15, quae et praesidio et ornamento *sit* civitati; (15) Cic. *de dom. sua*, 32, quae multo *est* verbosior; (16) Cato, *R. R.* 38. 4, hoc signi *erit*, ubi calx cocta erit, summos lapides coctos *esse* oportebit; (17) Cic. *Tusc.* v. 7, nam sapientiam quidem ipsam quis negare potest non modo re *esse* antiquam, verum etiam nomine?; (18) Cic. *de Fin.* i. 11, quis alienum putet eius *esse* dignitatis, quam mihi quisque tribuat?; (19) Liv. v. 15. 9, respondit profecto iratos deos Veienti populo illo *fuisse* die, quo sibi eam mentem obiecissent; (20) Liv. vi. 12. 5, aut innumerabilem multitudinem liberorum capitum in eis *fuisse* locis, quae nunc vix . . .

A few words may be said by way of comment on these sentences. In each case the emphasis of a prominent word draws the copula within the influence of that word, and so makes the connection between the two members closer than the connection between the copula and any other word in the sentence. The verb thus seems to give its force to this word alone, and to bring it forward as the important fact of which it states a truth. Thus, if in (6) or (7) we place the copula after each word successively, the difference in the shade of thought is apparent. With *hoc signi erit* (16) we may compare our *tum erit tempus* above. The idea of *signum* is brought forward for the first time in the words *hoc signi erit*; in the other case, the idea of *tempus* has, as noticed above, already been suggested before the words *tum erit tempus* are introduced. In the one case something is stated about *signi*, in the other something about *tum*. The importance of the copula seems to lie in its parasitic character,

and it attaches itself to the word of which a truth is stated; that is, to the word with which it belongs logically. Similar to (16) is Cato, *R. R.* 88. 1, *id aliquotiens in die cotidie facito, usque adeo donec sal desiverit tabescere biduum. id signi erit: menam aridam vel ovum demittito; si natabit, ea muries erit.* In (3), although *nullam* is the more emphatic word, *breviorem* receives the support of *esse*, because, being the word which paves the way for the clause that follows, it is the word to be brought into relief. (14) is an example of a not uncommon collocation. *Civitati*, as the least important idea, falls at the end of the clause; but is it not also the case that prominence is given to *praesidio* and *ornamento* by the position of *sit*? *Sit* is made to seem to give its whole force to these two ideas, and, by closing in a way the thought at that point, to exclude, as of slight importance, the idea of *civitati*. It is about *praesidio* and *ornamento* that the truth is stated, not about *civitati*. (10) is a case of the copula not attached immediately to the emphatic word, but still influenced by it. *Tanta* carries its emphasis through *dulcedo*, which it limits, to *est*. Still greater prominence would be given to *tanta* if *est* followed it immediately, as is the case with *erat* in (9). In (18) the verb is appended to a genitive, and in (19), (20), and (17) to an ablative. In each case, however, the word to which it is appended, though not the most emphatic word in the sentence, is a prominent word and one needing to be brought into relief, as being (excepting in (17)) a word leading to a clause. So, in (19), if *fuisse* fell anywhere else in the sentence, *illo* would lose much of its prominence; the verb being where it is, *profecto iratos deos Veienti populo* are at once the emphatic words of the sentence, and *illo* is saved from falling quite into shadow. Thus: 'He replied that the gods had surely been angry with the people of Veii, — on *that* day, that is, they had been angry, on which they had put that thought into his head'; but the Latin can say it all in one statement and with one verb. In (13) something of prominence seems to be given to *qualis* by the position of *esset*. *Qualis*, and not *natura*, is the word with which *esset* is closely connected in thought; the contrary would be the case if *esset* fell later in the clause. This position of the copula, closely following the interrogative word, is a not uncommon one. It is also not uncommon for the copula to fall early in a relative or demonstrative

clause.¹ It is possible that the order is to be explained in such cases by the fact that the connection between the subject and the verb is felt to be closer than that between the verb and any other part of the clause.²

Hitherto the copula alone has been considered. But the working of the principle extends to other verbs as well. Thus, in Liv. vii. 30. 17, *non loquor apud recusantem iusta bella populum; sed tamen, si ostenderitis auxilia vestra, ne bello quidem arbitror vobis opus fore*, the verb *arbitror* gives us the effect by its position of modifying *bello* alone. The word seems drawn to the place it occupies by the emphasis of *bello*. So, in English, the position of the word *do* is comparable: 'Not even of war do I think you will find there is need.' Perhaps the same feeling which induced the Roman to put *arbitror* immediately after *ne bello quidem*, almost obliges us to do what is equivalent to inverting the subject and verb.³ Here (as well

¹ E.g. Caes. *B. G.* i. 7, *pontem, qui erat ad Genavam*; i. 10, *quae civitas est in provincia*; i. 10, *hi sunt extra provinciam*; Sall. *Jug.* 85. 30, *hae sunt meae imagines, haec nobilitas*. The following is an interesting example of the use of the copula: Liv. ii. 15. 3, *ea esse vota omnium, ut, qui libertati erit in illa urbe finis, idem urbi sit. proinde, si salvam esse vellet Romam, ut patiatur liberam esse, orare*.

² Observe the word which *εἶναι* follows in these two Greek sentences. Lys. xvi. 1, *ἡγοῦμαι γὰρ τοῖς ἀδίκως διαβεβλημένοις τούτους εἶναι μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν αἰτίους, οἵτινες ἂν αὐτοὺς ἀναγκάζωσιν εἰς ἔλεγχον τῶν αὐτοῖς βεβιωμένων καταστήναι*. Lys. xvi. 3, *δέομαι ὑμῶν ἐμὲ μὲν δοκιμάζειν, τούτους δὲ ἡγεῖσθαι χείρους εἶναι*. So often the predicate position of adjective or noun; e.g. Lys. xii. 37, *ἤξιουν ἱκανὰ εἶναι τὰ κατηγορημένα. εἶναι*, by its position, not only emphasizes *ἱκανά*, but also makes prominent the dependence on *ἱκανά* of *τὰ κατηγορημένα*.

³ Comparison may also be made to the position of the verb in the German sentence when any other word than the subject comes first: *Haben Sie ihn gestern oder vorgestern gesehen? Vorgestern habe ich ihn gesehen*. Does this order of verb and subject owe its origin to the fact that the first place is one of emphasis and that the verb tends to attach itself as closely as possible to the word to which it really gives its meaning? *Habe*, by its position, shows that *gesehen* is, in a way, a modifier of *vorgestern*. If *vorgestern ich habe ihn gesehen* could stand, the last words would introduce a new truth; as it is, *vorgestern* represents the only advance made in the thought, and the other words attach themselves to *vorgestern* in a parasitic way. The same tendency is continually present in the English; e.g. 'never shall I see him again.' Comparing the two expressions, 'For twelve whole years was that the case,' and 'For twelve whole years that was the case,' shall we not say that more importance is given to the words *for twelve whole years* in the

as in the case of the copula) the Greek is parallel to the Latin; e.g. Dem. xix. 1, ὅση μὲν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, σπουδῇ περὶ τουτοῦ τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ παραγγελία γέγονε, σχεδὸν οἶμαι πάντας ὑμᾶς ἡσθήσθαι. It is *σχεδόν* that is emphasized, and emphasized because *οἶμαι* modifies it in thought. Thus: 'I am pretty sure about everybody has learned this, — perhaps not everybody, but nearly everybody, I think.' Thus an emphatic adjective or other word often draws the verb to itself and leaves the modified word to fall at the end of the sentence; e.g. Liv. i. 7. 13, *forte ita evenit, ut Potitii ad tempus praesto essent, iisque exta adponerentur, Pinarii extis adesis ad ceteram venirent dapem. Ceteram*, being singled out to receive the whole force of the verb, seems to be rather more emphatic than if *dapem* had been placed with it. It gains perspective. The point is, not that they shared in the feast, but that they shared in the part of the feast that followed.

I subjoin a few sentences in which the position of the verb, and the effect due thereto, are noteworthy.

(a) Cic. *Acad.* ii. 118, princeps Thales . . . ex aqua *dixit* constare omnia; (b) Cic. *de leg. Man.* 19, non enim possunt una in civitate multi rem ac fortunas amittere, ut non plures secum in eandem *trahant* calamitatem; (c) Cic. *pro Sull.* 1, sed quoniam ita *tulit* casus infestus ut . . .; (d) Liv. v. 41. 2, qui eorum curules *gesserant* magistratus . . .; (e) Liv. v. 40. 6, inde pars per agros dilapsi, pars urbes *petunt* finitimas.

Of course, in all these cases the last word is unemphatic, but whatever importance the verb in question has seems to be due to its close connection in thought with the highly emphatic word pre-

first sentence than in the second? At the same time, the position of *was* makes the dependence of the last idea on this prominent idea more marked. The verb, by attaching itself to the emphatic word or phrase, when there is one preëminently emphatic word or phrase in the sentence, emphasizes the subordination of the other ideas. Compare the expressions 'said he,' 'said I,' and the like, used when a direct quotation precedes. These are apt to come after emphatic words or clauses. The usage which makes the verb in Sanskrit unaccented or enclitic may also be mentioned; e.g. *agnīm idē purōhitam*. See Whitney's *Grammar*, 592. If we needed any proof that *est* is often enclitic to the preceding word, we should have it in such combinations as *humanumst*. With the sentence in the text, compare Sall. *Jug.* 82. 1, *reges opperitur melius esse ratus cognitis Mauris, quoniam is novus hostis adcesserat, ex commodo, pugnam facere*.

ceding; that is, if the preceding idea were not so prominent in the writer's mind, the verb would be more likely to fall at the end. Further, it is not simply a matter of separating two words which belong together, in order to give the attention time to linger on the emphatic idea. Something of this effect certainly does result, but there is also a genuine logical reason why the verb should occupy the position it does. It is possible that we have here the origin of what seems to have become more or less of a stylistic trick. In the sentences above the position of the verb is explained in each case by the emphasis of the preceding word; but in some cases there seems to be little or no such emphasis present, and it was apparently more or less of a recognized *σχήμα* to separate two closely connected words at the end of the sentence by a verb. Nepos is particularly rich in such forms. The following case of the present participle may be added to the above examples; Liv. v. 14. 1, *quorum prope maior patribus quam belli cura erat, quippe non communicatum modo cum plebe, sed prope amissum cernentibus summum imperium.*

The same tendency seems to be at work in sentences similar to the following: Isocr. xv. 125, οὕτω πρῶως διώκει καὶ νομίμως; and 302, πολλὰ γὰρ καλλίω δόξαν ἐκείνων κτώμενοι τῇ πόλει τυγχάνουσι καὶ μᾶλλον ἀρμόττουσαν. Professor Goodell, in commenting on these passages,¹ remarks that νομίμως and ἀρμόττουσαν gain an emphasis because, coming after the thought is really closed, they in a way begin a new sentence. Is it not the case that πρῶως and καλλίω also gain by the separation? The idea expressed in each case by these words is so prominent in the mind of the speaker that, for the moment feeling it to be the sole idea, he hastens to close the thought by bringing in the verb, and then, as it were, bethinks himself of the second idea. The greater the number of ideas introduced before the thought closes, the less is the comparative prominence of each single idea.²

¹ p. 37 of the article cited above.

² Cf. Xen. An. ii. 4. 21, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ὅτι πολλὴ καὶ κῶμαι ἔνεισι καὶ πόλεις πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα. Similar, as far as the effect on the word preceding the verb is concerned, are the following: Cic. Tusc. v. 1, *quintus hic dies, Brute, finem faciet Tusculanarum disputationum*; Sall. Cat. 4. 4, *nam id facinus in primis ego memorabile existimo sceleris atque periculi novitate*; Cic. de Div. ii. 2, *quintus eum locum complexus est, qui . . .*; Sall. Jug. 8. 2, *si permanere vellet in suis artibus.*

The remoter effects of the principle here under discussion are not always obvious. Some mention should therefore be made of those cases in which the copula is combined with the future participle, the perfect participle, and the gerundive to form the compound tenses of the verb. Properly, of course, there is no normal order for the two members of these combinations, and the copula should be as free here to shift its place as when it is used in combination with substantive, adjective, or other part of speech. In the nature of the case, however, when the participle or gerundive is present, that is likely to be the word in the sentence which the copula oftenest modifies in thought, and it is true that the prevailing order is participle (or gerundive) followed by copula. The usage is subject to fluctuations, however, owing to individual peculiarities of style and thought. Thus, in Sallust there are only two cases in which the copula precedes the participle, and one of these is in Catiline's letter to Catulus. In general, Sallust's style is one in which the principle in question plays very little part. In Nepos, on the other hand, where the working of the principle is everywhere prominent, there are, in round numbers, two-thirds as many cases in which the copula precedes the participle (or gerundive) as there are cases in which the order is the reverse.

The examples of inversion (for convenience this term may be used to designate the less common order) in which the copula follows immediately the emphatic word are numerous, and are not essentially different from cases of the use of the copula which have been considered above. The following may serve to illustrate :

(α) Liv. vii. 31. 11, *haec legatis agentibus in concilio Samnitiū adeo est ferociter responsum ut . . .*; (β) Liv. ii. 7. 10, *adeone est fundata leviter fides . . . ?*; (γ) Caes. *B. G.* vii. 30, *et sic sunt animo consternati . . . ut . . .*; (δ) Liv. v. 28. 7, *pavorque inde Verruginem etiam ad praesidium alterum est perlatus*; (ε) Nep. *Eum.* 12. 1, *a quo tot annos adeo essent male habiti ut . . .*; (ζ) Nep. *Tim.* 1. 6, *quibus rebus ille adeo est commotus ut . . .*; (η) Nep. *Hamil.* 2. 3, *quibus malis adeo sunt Poeni perterriti ut . . .*; (θ) Liv. vi. 41. 1, *et ita maxima sunt adepturi, ut nihil ne pro minimis quidem debeant.*

It is difficult in some cases to say just how far the participle is on its way to being an adjective, but the idea of completion seems often

to be present in a greater or less degree. Sometimes the influence of the emphatic word is carried over one or more intervening words to the verb, but it is still sufficient to cause inversion. Such are the following :

(ι) Caes. *B. G.* vii. 25, nec prius ille *est* a propugnatoribus vacuus relictus locus, quam . . . ; (κ) Liv. v. 27. 10, tanta mutatio animis *est* iniecta ut . . . ; (λ) Caes. *B. G.* ii. 27, horum adventu tanta rerum commutatio *est* facta ut . . . ; (μ) Caes. *B. G.* vii. 42, quae maxime illi hominum generi *est* innata.

Less obvious are the following :

(ν) Liv. vi. 23. 5, qui adveniēns castra urbesque primo impetu capere *sit* solitus, eum residem intra vallum tempus terere ; (ξ) Liv. v. 11. 15, pro certo se habere neminem in contione stare, qui illo die non caput, domum fortunasque L. Verginii ac M. Sergii *sit* exsecratus detestatusque ; (ο) Liv. xxii. 19. 7, tumultusque prius in terra et castris quam ad mare et ad naves *est* ortus.

In the first sentence there are two contrasted pictures ; each word in the relative clause, as being a part of the first picture, and so standing in contrast to what is in the second, is emphatic, and this emphasis is sufficient to cause the inversion. In the second sentence the idea from *illo die* through *Sergii* is emphatic, and the emphasis is distinctly greater than it would be if *sit* followed the participles. The participles coming at the end, all the emphasis falls on the preceding ideas. In the third sentence the force of *prius* is carried through to the end. In each of these passages the prominence of the idea preceding the verb is sufficient in itself to make the idea contained in the participle seem an unimportant one, and so to throw it to the end. By monopolizing the whole force of the part of the verb which, while it states existence, adds nothing to the picture, it gains in vividness. To illustrate : If the question were asked, 'To what extent were they frightened?' , the answer might be, as in (γ) above, *sic sunt animo consternati ut . . .* ('to such an extent were they frightened that . . .'). *Sunt*, by its position, shows that the force of the whole verb, participle as well as copula, goes with *sic*. Now, the extent of their consternation is felt to be so striking that, without any previous suggestion of the idea of fright, the emphasis of *sic* is

alone sufficient to draw *sunt* to itself, and so to throw the idea of *consternati* into shadow; the extent of the fright would be somewhat less prominently brought to our notice if *sunt* fell after *consternati*.¹ So is it, I think, in many less obvious cases, as (v), (ξ), and (o).

One imagines that in the following sentence something of vividness is given to the picture by the order *sunt usi*: Caes. B. G. ii. 32, *et tamen circiter parte tertia . . . celata atque in oppido retenta, portis patefactis, eo die pace sunt usi*. The three features, *portis patefactis*, *eo die*, *pace*, coming out with so much individual distinctness, seem to gain perspective through the position of *sunt*. The point is necessarily very intangible, however, and it may be doubted by some whether *usi sunt* would be anything other than slightly different euphonically. The following sentences may be compared with the above: Liv. v. 21. 17, *atque ille dies caede hostium ac direptione urbis opulentissimae est consumptus*; Caes. B. G. vii. 28, *parsque ibi, cum angusto exitu portarum se ipsi premerent, a militibus, pars iam egressa portis ab equitibus est interfecta*; Caes. B. G. vii. 25 (last verb), *nec prius ille est a propugnatoribus vacuus relictus locus, quam restincto aggere atque omni ex parte submotis hostibus finis est pugnandi factus*. The sentence at the end of the following passage is also worth examining: Liv. i. 46. 1, *Servius quamquam iam usu haud dubie regnum possederat, tamen, quia interdum iactari voces a iuvene Tarquinio audiebat se iniussu populi regnare, conciliata prius voluntate plebis agro capto ex hostibus viritim diviso ausus est ferre ad populum, vellent iuberentne se regnare; tantoque consensu, quanto haud quisquam alius ante, rex est declaratus*. The position of *est* brings *rex* to our notice with almost the vividness of the spoken word.

Enough has been said to suggest that most of the other combinations cited by Weil as examples of *repose of accent* have a logical explanation as well. A few may be briefly referred to. Thus, *āv*, which often performs the function of a finger-post to the verb that follows, frequently suggests by its position that the whole force of

¹ Sometimes the whole verb, copula and participle, follows the emphatic word; e.g. Nep. Eum. 12. 1, *admirarentur non iam de eo sumptum esse supplicium, a quo . . .* Here it is easy to feel the lack of emphasis of *supplicium*, but it is hard to see that *sumptum esse* is emphatic except in so far as it closely modifies in thought the emphatic word *eo*.

that verb is to be given to a single emphatic word; e.g. Dem. i. 1, ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἂν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, χρημάτων ἡμᾶς ἐλέσθαι νομίζω—‘more than much wealth (i.e. it would be much, no slight amount) would you prize it if . . .’ As, in the sentences (a) to (θ) above, the copula alone is sufficient to show that the force of the whole verb, participle and all, belongs to the emphatic word, so here the same is the case with the particle. The vocative commonly falls after an emphatic word or phrase; e.g. Cic. *de Div.* i. 11, *ego vero, inquam, philosophiae, Quinte, semper vaco.* The attention of the person addressed is thereby called to the word or phrase in question, as if that were the important part of the utterance and the part to which he is to direct his thoughts. Similarly other words are attracted to the parts of the sentence they distinctly modify. Compare the following: Lys. vii. 6, ὁ πόλεμος καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν αἴτιος κακῶν γεγένηται; Dem. i. 22, εἰ δὲ τούτων ἀποστερηθήσεται τῶν χρημάτων; Dem. i. 27, οὐδεμῶς ἐλάττων ζημίας.¹

The inquiry might be carried further, but this brief examination is perhaps sufficient to show that it is not a fortuitous circumstance that the copula and other apparently unimportant words of the sentence follow in the wake of emphatic words, and, further, that the position of such words is not, as a rule, a matter of indifference logically. This conclusion does not belittle the part that other factors, such as euphony and the desire for variety, play in the sentence, for it is plain that virtually the same idea may be expressed in a variety of ways. Nor does it deny that Weil's explanation of the phenomenon in question is true as far as it goes. After all has been said, however, it must be admitted that there are many cases our feeling for which is so intangible as to seem to defy analysis, and this is especially true of the combinations of participle or gerundive with copula.

¹ Similar is the position of *quisque* after *se*, *suus*, and of *uterque*, *homines*, and *plerique* in the following sentences: Caes. *B. C.* i. 40, *suas uterque legiones reducit*; ii. 39, *ut de suis homines laudibus libenter praedicant*; iii. 95, *missis plerique armis*.